Montana Board of Oil and Gas Conservation Environmental Assessment

1

(possible concerns)

Steam crossings: None anticipated.

High erosion potential: No, location will require a moderate cut of up to 14.4' and small fill, up to 4.6',

required.

Loss of soil productivity: _None, location to be restored after drilling well, if nonproductive. If productive unused portion of wellsite will be reclaimed.

Unusually large wellsite: No, large well site designed as a dual well pad, 500'X500'.

Damage to improvements: Slight, surface use is cultivated land.

Conflict with existing land use/values: Slight

3	• .	
Mit	1 mat	101
17111	ıצaı	иоп

- __ Avoid improvements (topographic tolerance)
- __ Exception location requested
- X Stockpile topsoil
- __ Stream Crossing Permit (other agency review)
- X Reclaim unused part of wellsite if productive
- __ Special construction methods to enhance reclamation
- <u>X</u> Other <u>Requires DEQ General Permit for Storm Water Discharge Associated with</u> <u>Construction Activity, under ARM 17.30.1102(28)</u>

Comments: Will use existing county roads, #347 and #138. About 47' of new access road will be built into this location off existing east-west county road. Cuttings will be solidified with flyash and buried in the lined reserve pit. Oil base invert drilling fluids will be recycled. Completion fluids will be removed and hauled to commercial Class II Disposal. The pit after solidification will be folded in and covered with subsoil. If well is not productive subsoil will be spread and topsoil will be spread on top of the subsoil. No concerns.

Health Hazards/Noise

(possible concerns)

Proximity to public facilities/residences: <u>Closest residence about 1/4 of a mile to the northeast from this location</u>. Town of Sidney is about 13 miles to the south southeast from this location.

Possibility of H2S: _Slight

Size of rig/length of drilling time: Triple drilling rig 30 to 35 days drilling time.

Mitigation:

- X Proper BOP equipment
- __ Topographic sound barriers
- __ H2S contingency and/or evacuation plan
- __ Special equipment/procedures requirements

Other

Comments: Adequate surface casing cemented to surface with working BOP stack should mitigate any problems. Sufficient distance between location and buildings noise should not be a problem.

Wildlife/recreation

(possible concerns)

Proximity to sensitive wildlife areas (DFWP identified): None identified.

Proximity to recreation sites: None identified

Creation of new access to wildlife habitat: No

Conflict with game range/refuge management: No

Threatened or endangered Species: <u>Species identified as threatened or endangered are the Pallid</u>
Sturgeon, Interior Lease Tern, Whooping Crane and Piping Plover. Candidate species are the Greater Sage
Grouse and the Sprague's Pipit. MTFWP Natural Heritage Tracker website indicates no species of concerns.

Mitigation:

- __ Avoidance (topographic tolerance/exception)
- __ Other agency review (DFWP, federal agencies, DSL)

Screening/fencing of pits, drillsite Other:
Comments: Private cultivated surface lands. No concerns.
Historical/Cultural/Paleontological
(possible concerns) Proximity to known sites: None identified.
Mitigation avoidance (topographic tolerance, location exception) other agency review (SHPO, DSL, federal agencies) Other:
Comments: Surface location is private cultivated land. No concerns.
Social/Economic
(possible concerns) Substantial effect on tax base Create demand for new governmental services Population increase or relocation Comments: Wildcat Bakken Formation horizontal well. No concerns.
Remarks or Special Concerns for this site
19,988'MD/10,445'TVD Bakken Formation single lateral horizontal well test. Location was constructed to accommodate a second well on the same well location. No concerns.
Summary: Evaluation of Impacts and Cumulative effects
Short term impacts expected, no long term impacts anticipated.
I conclude that the approval of the subject Notice of Intent to Drill (does/ <u>does not</u>) constitute a major action of state government significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, and (does/ <u>does not</u>) require the preparation of an environmental impact statement.
Prepared by (BOGC): /s/Steven Sasaki (title:) Chief Field Inspector Date: May 11, 2011 Other Persons Contacted:
Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology, Groundwater Information Center GWIC website (Name and Agency) Richland County water wells

(subject discussed)
May 11, 2011
(date)
US Fish and Wildlife, Region 6 website
(Name and Agency)
ENDANGERED, THREATENED, PROPOSED AND CANDIDATE SPECIES MONTANA
COUNTIES, Richland County
(subject discussed)
May 11, 2011
(date)
M (N (LH ') D W L' (CWD)
Montana Natural Heritage Program Website (FWP)
(Name and Agency)
Heritage State Rank= S1, S2, S3, T28N R58E
(subject discussed)
_May 11, 2011
(date)
(date)
If location was inspected before permit approval:
Inspection date:
Inspector:
Others present during inspection: